

[2nd September 1950]

(b) The Government have asked the Director to permit the opening of two high schools, one at Bukkapatnam and the other at Kothacheruvu in the current year as the District Board requested for it."

Allegations against certain Prohibition officials of the West Godavari district.

* 22 Q.—SRI P. VEERABHADRASWAMI (on behalf of Sri A. Govindacharyulu) : Will the Hon. the Minister for Prohibition be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received any petitions containing serious allegations against any Prohibition officials of the West Godavari district;

(b) if so, when, from whom, the number of petitions and the nature of the complaint; and

(c) whether the Government have taken any action on those petitions and, if so, what the action taken is and if not, why not?

THE HON. SRI N. SANJEEVA REDDI :—“(a) to (c) The Government have received some petitions containing allegations against certain Prohibition officials in the West Godavari district and they are in various stages of disposal.

“As the correspondence and the investigation connected with these petitions are treated as strictly confidential, the Government consider that it is not in the public interest to furnish the further particulars asked for.”

SRI R. SURYANARAYANA RAO :—“May I know, Sir, whether the cases in which investigations have been conducted will be enquired into, and if so, whether it will be an open enquiry?”

THE HON. SRI N. SANJEEVA REDDI :—“If there is sufficient material, we will refer it to the Tribunal and there will be an enquiry by the Tribunal, if necessary, Sir.”

[Note.—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—MESSAGE FROM THE ASSEMBLY.

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“I have to announce to the House that I have received a message from the Hon. Speaker of the Madras Legislative Assembly, dated 1st September 1950 :—

‘In accordance with rule 99 of the Madras Assembly Rules, I transmit a copy of the Madras Elementary Education (Amendment) Bill, 1950 (L.A. Bill No. 12 of 1950), as passed by the Assembly on the 1st September 1950 and signed by me for the concurrence of the Council.’”

III.—DISCUSSION ON THE FOOD SITUATION IN THE STATE.

THE HON. SRI J. L. P. ROCHE VICTORIA :—“Mr. Chairman, Sir, I beg to move—

that the food situation in the State be taken into consideration.”

2nd September 1950] [Sri J. L. P. Roche Victoria]

"Sir, since the last debate in the Legislative Assembly on the same question, there has been some improvement in the situation and with a view to inform hon. Members about the present position, a supplementary note^a has been prepared and circulated to all hon. Members of this House."

JANAB K. UPPI :—"I want to know what supplemental information has been supplied to hon. Members, Sir. Many of us have not received the supplementary note referred to by the Hon. Minister for Food."

MR. CHAIRMAN :—"I was told that it has already been circulated to all hon. Members of this House. I learn that the supplementary note was circulated among all hon. Members through a special messenger. If any of the hon. Members have not received it, they will be supplied with copies now."

THE HON. SRI J. L. P. ROCHE VICTORIA :—"Sir, now that the statement has been placed in the hands of all hon. Members, I would invite them, in the light of the facts and figures given therein, to offer their suggestions and advice with a view to see how best we can tackle the present food situation and tide over the immediate crisis. Though, of course, Sir, the position has somewhat improved since the last debate in the Assembly, still we have got to get over the present difficult period of food-shortage in this State. The Central Government's supplies are also now coming in and as far as our procurement is concerned, we have tightened it up as best as we can and we hope to tide over the situation until the next harvest, when we hope that sufficient quantity of food would be available for ensuring a regular supply thereafter."

"Sir, I need hardly say anything more at this stage, and I would request hon. Members to give their consideration to this note and offer their suggestions to help the Government in tiding over the present food crises in this State."

MR. CHAIRMAN :—"The hon. Member Mr. B. Narayanaswami Naidu has given notice of a number of amendments. I should like to know whether he would like to speak first. If he wants, let him move his amendments one by one and speak on them or let him move them all at once."

SRI B. NARAYANASWAMI NAYUDU :—"Mr. Chairman, Sir, I should like to move them all at once so that they might have a cumulative effect."

"Sir, I beg to move the first amendment standing in my name, which runs as follows :—

and on such consideration this Council resolves

- (i) *that the Government should dissociate itself so far as Madras State is concerned with the Basic Plan for 1950 of the Government of India as originally laid down or*

[Sri B. Narayanaswami Nayudu] [2nd September 1950]

revived in April or as it exists to-day and that the Government of Madras State should get the Government of India to secure immediately by import or otherwise a minimum of 1 lakh of tons of rice, broken rice, and millets excluding wheat altogether failing which the control over distribution and the prices of foodgrains assumed by the Central Government in 1948 should be terminated and the Madras State Government be allowed to import itself the foodgrains required;

- (ii) *that the Government of Madras State should before participating or consenting to any basic plan for 1951 or subsequent years consult the legislatures of the State and obtain its views on the quotas to be obtained by the Madras State both as regards quantity and variety of foodgrains and the Government of the State after the basic plan for 1951 is finalized should place the same before the Legislature of the Madras State for its consideration and action thereon, if any.*

2-45
p.m.

“Again and again the Hon. the Food Minister says ‘I cannot do anything; it is the Government of India that has asked us to do so.’ The whole question is when this Council first discussed this question of food. Is it when practically the year was out, or is it January when the basic plan was evolved, in Delhi, or is it when it was reviewed in April or subsequently? The whole question is what is the deficiency and how to meet it. It is pre-eminently a question for this State. Therefore, with regard to the basic plan, they should have the views of the Legislature. We have got the Government of India plan. What is it they have done? They say that according to present estimates, despite the deficiency due to seasonal conditions—reference to this includes failure due to monsoons—the production in 1949-50 is better than last year by 2 million tons. In spite of the failure of monsoon and in spite of cyclone, they want to say that the all-India situation is better. May I ask the Hon. Minister for Food to say what is the estimate of procurement which this Government placed before the Central Government in Delhi in January 1950 in order to get our quota? This is a fundamental question, and, if necessary, I shall sit down to get an answer. What is the quota that was placed before the Central Government in Delhi? What is the figure that was given as the procurement figure in this State? Upon that will depend the decision of the Government of India. Upon that will depend our discussion on this debate. I daresay no answer will be given. Probably it will never be given. The figures must be available with the Food Secretary.”

THE HON. SRI J. L. P. ROCHE VICTORIA:—“When we prepared our estimate of requirements for this State, we placed before the Government of India the figure of 8 lakhs of tons to meet the deficit in food this year. This proposal was put before the Government of India as early as January or early February when there was the Food Ministers’ Conference in Delhi. Immediately after that, the Government of India said that they were able to allot

2nd September 1950] [Sri J. L. P. Roche Victoria]

us only 3 lakhs of tons, and they left over the balance to be allotted at a later date. We were assured of more supplies at a later date. It was not until June 1950 a definite quota of another 2½ lakhs was given to us. On the whole out of our request for 8 lakhs of tons, we have so far been allotted a quantity of 5½ lakhs of tons of rice, wheat and other foodgrains. Our requirement was put at 8 lakhs of tons. After this, conditions in our State also deteriorated. Our requirements have increased because the south-west monsoon did not arrive in time. Because of the failure of the monsoon, in several places even the ordinary dry crops failed. Naturally our requirement of food increased as the year advanced until we reached the critical period in July this year."

SRI B. NARAYANASWAMI NAYUDU :—" I am much obliged to the Hon. Minister for Food who had given me the figures. He stated that they demanded 8 lakhs of tons. I have no doubt that they would have demanded so much. What I want to know is, what is the estimated procurement in this State that was placed before the Central Government in Delhi? How much was expected to be procured in this State? The Government of India must know first how much this State expected to procure. What is the figure given to them by the Hon. the Food Minister? What has happened to the 8 lakhs of tons placed before the Central Government? The Government of India stated 'we will give you 3 lakhs of tons'. What is the position of the Government of Madras then? Is it the position of 'Do Do Basavanna'? (What is it?) Hon. Members would have seen the man in the streets holding a bull. Whatever the man says, the bull will simply nod its head. That is 'Do Do Basavanna'. Should the Government of Madras say 'Do Do Basavanna' to whatever the Government of India says? When we want 8 lakhs of tons, and when the Government of India say that they will allot 3 lakhs of tons, this 'Do Do Basavanna' would not do. Another question I want to put to this Government. How much rice did they ask the Government of India to supply? What is the policy of the Government of India with regard to it? (Hon. Members: 'No, No, Basavanna'.) (Laughter.) That is exactly the point."

THE HON. SRI K. MADHAVA MENON :—" Sir, the estimated procurement for this year is 12 lakhs of tons of rice and 1 lakh ton of millets. Last year, the actual procurement was 13.66 lakhs tons of rice and 0.76 lakh ton of millets."

SRI B. NARAYANASWAMI NAYUDU :—" I am going to say that the Government estimate is far below the mark, and has been falsified by the results. Three days ago I wanted this information. Now, I am extremely grateful to the Government for having supplied me with this information. Three days before when I desired the Leader of the Opposition to get this information, this information could not be got. Now, I am very grateful to the Hon. Minister, Mr. Madhava Menon, for the information. Anyhow, this Government estimated that 12 lakhs tons of rice could be procured. The procurement is only 8 lakhs of tons so far. Even according to

[Sri B. Narayanaswami Nayudu] [2nd September 1950]

the food note given by the Government of Madras, it cannot exceed 10 lakhs tons of rice. Who is responsible for this procurement estimate? Is it Delhi? The next point is: what did the Government of India say? They said 'no more rice'. Another major decision they took was 'rice is more expensive than other food-grains', and therefore there should be no imports of rice for the purpose of this decision. Is this what the Government of Madras agreed to on behalf of the people of this State? If the Government of India say 'no more rice', should our Government act like 'Do, Do, Basavanna' and say 'yes'?"

MR. CHAIRMAN :—"I request the hon. Member to maintain the prestige and dignity of this House. Once in a way he can use the term 'Do, Do, Basavanna' but not often. I do not personally like it."

SRI B. NARAYANASWAMI NAYUDU :—"I shall not say any more 'Do, Do, Basavanna.' But it is, what may be called acquiescence or submission to the dictates of the dictators at Delhi. What did this Government say when the Government of India said 'We shall not import rice from 1950 onwards'? Did this Government say 'Yes' or did they say 'No'? Why that matter was not brought before the Legislature? The decision was taken in January. Why was this not brought before the Legislature? There is another decision with regard to millets. Hon. Members are aware that millets are the mainstay in rural areas. What has the Government of India said in this matter? They have already indicated that they do not propose to import millets from foreign countries, and hence they cannot accept any allotment of millets under the basic plan. So, it comes to this, that is, no more millets, and no rice. That is the position to which this Government of Madras have brought this State. Is this right? Is it to be approved by this Legislature? Are the Government going to say to the people, 'We shall have no rice and we shall have no millets and that we shall live only on wheat'? Or are they going to say to the Government of India that we want more rice and more millets? The Government of India say that we shall not have millets or milo, but that we should have only wheat. This wheat is not being used at all in rural parts. Therefore, my amendment really means that before a decision is taken in January or April, the Legislatures should be consulted and their views taken. The matter should be placed before the Legislature after the basic plan for 1951 is finalized. I ask whether the Government of Madras acquiesce in the position that we shall not have rice and that we shall not have millets, but shall have only wheat and milo. What is the economic structure of the Madras Government? Are the Government going to turn this State into a wheat State? I do not propose to go into that question at all now. I ask, is it right on the part of this State Government to say 'Yes' or 'ditto' to the Government at Delhi? The Government of Madras should, before participating or consenting to any basic plan for 1951 or subsequent years, consult the Legislatures of the State and obtain their views on the quotas to be

2nd September 1950] [Sri B. Narayanaswami Nayudu]

obtained by the Madras State both as regards quantity and variety of foodgrains and the Government of the State, after the basic plan for 1951 is finalized, should place the same before the Legislatures of the Madras State for their consideration and action thereon, if any. I submit that this is the minimum that has to be assured. It is not at all derogatory to the prestige of this Government, if they agree to this proposal. On the other hand, it will arm them with necessary powers to impress on the Government of India that we require more allotments of rice and millets. It is a very curious position that plans have been evolved by an authority who is not subject to this Legislature at all. But all the same we are asked to submit to that plan. Therefore, I say that the second part of the amendment is necessary. It says that hereafter the Legislature should be consulted.

“ The first part of the amendment refers to the immediate shortage. I wish the hon. Members realize the gravity of the situation. So far as short-term plan is concerned, there is no question of self-sufficiency or attainment of self-sufficiency. They are all goals to be reached. But they cannot be put forward as an immediate solution of the problem. What should be the objective of this Government is the problem. How are we to manage next year? The year 1946-47 is considered a normal year when monsoons did not fail and production was at the ordinary level. The year 1947-48 was a lean year in which monsoons failed, and we had been suffering from famine conditions. The only difference between the years 1948-49 and 1949-50 is that in 1949-50 there was cyclone in the Circars, in the delta areas. Then, what about the year 1946-47? It was a normal year. The requirements of the Presidency in that year to be imported from outside was about 16 lakhs of tons of rice, about 1 lakh tons of millets and a few thousands of tons of wheat, making a total of about 18 lakhs. In that year, there was no failure of monsoon, no failure of rains and there was no cyclone in the country. Even then, the country had to import large quantities of foodgrains. What is the position with regard to last year? Last year was a lean year and we had procured, according to the figures given in the statement, about 1,366,000 tons of rice, and about 76,000 tons of millets. So, it will be clear that in order to live on the 12 ounces ration, we have necessarily to import at least 18 lakhs of tons of rice. If you give a lesser quantity, there will certainly be more trouble. In this connexion, I may be permitted to read a statement prepared by the Government for the Food Council. It says, ‘ the shortage of foodgrains is mainly due to the cyclone in the Circars in October 1949, which according to estimates has caused loss of about 3.32 lakhs of tons of rice ’. According to the Government statement, the cyclone has caused the diminution in the procurement figures to the extent of 3.32 lakhs of tons. Therefore the estimated output of foodgrains in the State somewhere in January was not at all 12 lakhs but something in the neighbourhood of 10 or 9 lakhs of tons. Again, from a perusal of the figures relating to procurement even in the cyclone-affected districts of East Godavari and Guntur

3 p.m.

[Sri B. Narayanaswami Nayudu] [2nd September 1950]

it would be clear that procurement has not at all been slack. If more has not been procured, the reason for the same is that there is only very little of stock available. That is the first point which should be noted. A reference to this has been made even in the note circulated by the Food Department, dated 14th/15th June 1950. When there is only very little quantity available, what will be there to procure? As I have said, even in a normal year, we need about 18 lakhs of tons to be imported. So far as this year is concerned, we have procured only 843,000 tons and the Government say that they will not be able to procure more than 2.3 lakhs. Even when we take the wheat and milo, if given, the total will come to about only 13.96 or about 14 lakhs. So, with all your procurement, imports, Government grants and everything else, you will be able to get only 14 lakhs of tons. In the year 1946-47 the figure was about 18 lakhs of tons. Now you have got only 14 lakhs. Thus, there is a deficit of about 4 lakhs of tons. How are you going to meet this deficit? I already mentioned to you that the Government themselves have agreed that there is no slackness in procurement. Then what is the remedy and what is the alternative open to this Government to meet the situation? Are we not to say, as I have mentioned in my amendment, that the Madras Government should get the Government of India to secure immediately by import or otherwise a minimum of 1 lakh of tons of rice, broken rice and millets excluding wheat altogether failing which the control over distribution and the prices of foodgrains assured by the Central Government in 1948 should be terminated and the Madras State Government be allowed to import itself the foodgrains required? I ask what is the other remedy. What else can this Government do to meet the situation and to make up the deficit of four lakhs of tons of foodgrains? In my opinion, the amendment suggested by me is the only alternative open to this Government. We must definitely tell the Government of India that they should somehow or other get us by imports the necessary quota of foodgrains. Otherwise they will be failing in their duty to respond to the requirements of the States in the matter of distribution of foodgrains to the people. If for any reason they could not help us in the matter, we should also suggest to them a way to get out of our difficulty. That is why I have said 'failing which the control over distribution and the prices of foodgrains assumed by the Central Government in 1948 should be terminated and the Madras State Government be allowed to import itself the foodgrains required'. There is no other alternative. If you fail to help the people, I am afraid there will be serious repercussions. This should not be lost sight of. When we are facing such a serious situation as the present one and when we are face-to-face with a huge deficit of several lakhs of tons of foodgrains, I want to ask the hon. Members of this House whether it is not our duty to tell the Government of India that we cannot carry on unless they immediately secure by import the full quota of our food requirements? Unless we do this, I feel we cannot successfully meet the present crisis. Therefore I commend my amendment for the acceptance of the House."

2nd September 1950]

MR. CHAIRMAN :—"What is the idea of the hon. Member with regard to his amendments? Does he want to move each amendment separately and have a discussion on each of them or is he agreeable to move all the amendments so that the House could have a discussion on the whole subject?"

SRI B. NARAYANASWAMI NAYUDU :—"Sir, my submission is that the first amendment which stands in my name relates to what may be called the 'basic plan' and so it stands on a different footing from the rest of the amendments. So, I would like to move by amendments one after another."

MR. CHAIRMAN :—"I have no objection. But I am inclined to think that if each amendment is taken separately, there will not be enough time left to move the other amendments. Anyway, I have no objection."

DR. A. LAKSHMANASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—"I would like to know the procedure, Sir. Are we to have discussion on the general food situation or are we to speak on any particular amendment that is moved here?"

MR. CHAIRMAN :—"The amendment is there. If you like, you can speak for or against it or you can speak on the general food situation. I am not going to restrict the hon. Members' speeches. Each Member can speak as he likes."

* SRI R. SURYANARAYANA RAO :—"Mr. Chairman, Sir, in all the discussions on food, we are always thinking of procurement and the obligations of the statutorily rationed areas only. I would like the Legislature as well as the Government to think of the whole of the population of this State and the obligation which this State has in securing for them a reasonable amount of food-grains to maintain themselves. According to the statement which the Hon. Minister has presented to the Assembly, our normal production of rice was 49 lakhs of tons and 26½ lakhs of tons of millet. Even then, we were importing 5 lakhs of tons of rice. This year, the deficit in the production is estimated to be 10 lakhs of tons of rice,—these are all the figures given by the Hon. Minister for Food—and 3 lakhs of tons of millet, making a total of about 13 lakhs of tons. Together with the 5 lakhs of tons, viz., the deficit during pre-war years, the overall deficit comes to about 18 lakhs of tons, taking it for granted that since 1939 our population has not increased. If that is so, the targets fixed are not unreasonable and even if we reach our targets, I do not think we will be able to feed the population of this Province. I do not know on what basis the Government of India agreed to give three lakhs of tons and what figures were presented by this Government to them to enable them to come to a decision that 3 lakhs of tons would suffice. Later on, when this Government pleaded hard with the Government of India, they have increased it to 5½ lakhs. Therefore, taking the normal requirements of the Province without the 6 ounces or 7 ounces or 12 ounces of ration and taking the normal requirements of this State on the pre-war population

[Sri R. Suryanarayana Rao] [2nd September 1950]

basis, we require 12½ lakhs of tons more even if we secure 5½ lakhs from the Government of India. I would like the hon. Members of this House to have in mind the overall off-take and not the off-take of the rationed areas only. The Government of India through their Regional Food Commissioner evidently seem to be engaged in doing a sort of propaganda—not against the Madras Government—in trying to convince the public of the State of Madras that they have been very concerned about the state of things in this State and that they have been doing their best. Yesterday morning, a communique was issued by the Regional Food Commissioner representing the Government of India in this State that out of the 5½ lakhs of tons allotted, we had already secured 2.93 lakhs of tons. He says in that communique that some quantities are in transit. Until they are received, I am not sure whether they are meant for Madras or for Travancore or Cochin or Hyderabad. So far as we are concerned, we have received about 3 lakhs of tons. Sir, when the Government of India know that our normal requirements in this year is about 18 lakhs, how could they think that we would be satisfied with the 5½ lakhs of tons of foodgrains. My hon. Friend Mr. Narayanaswami Nayudu wanted this State Government to tell us whether they represented the true facts of the situation in this State to the Government of India and demanded that we need 18 lakhs of tons more. The Government of India must get the grains from somewhere, from other States in India or import them from outside the country. Or else, they should allow us to get the foodgrains that we need from any source that we like. That is the main point. Are we to be tied down to the Government of India which seem to be not at all convinced about our requirements? At any rate from the statements that the Ministers and other officials of the Central Government make, it appears that they seem to think that we can get along with 3 ounces or 6 ounces of rice ration for any length of time. Is it possible, Sir, for any citizen to go on with this 6 ounces rice ration and an overall ration of 12 ounces for any length of time even if this ration is assured?

3-15 p.m. “Is not the population being slowly emasculated? What do the Government of India show so much concern for? What have they done for us? With great difficulty they agreed to give 3 lakhs of tons more after giving 2½ lakhs of tons first. If the Government of India stick to their allotment of 5½ lakhs of tons, I submit that we may need much more to meet the requirements of this State. In spite of our best efforts to obtain all the surpluses possible in order to feed the deficit districts, we have not been very successful. As my hon. Friend, Mr. Narayanaswami Nayudu, said there are no surpluses in many districts owing to causes beyond the control of the ryots. Therefore, I feel a strong case there is for us to present to the Government of India that they have not taken into account all the facts that affect the interests of this State. The complacency of the Central Government amounts almost to cruelty. To ask us to go on with 5½ lakhs of tons of foodgrains when our needs according to normal estimates are 18 lakhs, is to ask us to continue

2nd September 1950] [Sri R. Suryanarayana Rao]

long on starvation diet. Is it fair on the part of any Government—whether it is the Madras Government, whether we are ruled by our own people or by outsiders—to ask us to be satisfied with 5½ lakhs? Much is made of procurement. We may be able to procure but if we procure that goes to feed to a certain extent only the deficit districts on reduced rations. When the overall production is less, when the overall off-take cannot be met, it is a crisis which no Government can look upon with equanimity. What my hon. Friend, Mr. Narayanaswami Nayudu, says is 'stand up for your State, tell the Government of India "we are not going to be satisfied with the small quantities you are giving"; tell them that it is their duty, their bounden duty, when they have taken us into their so-called basic plan, to provide us with food'. Sir, the Government of India do not supply us food at their own cost. Every pie they pay for the foodgrains is taken back from us and they must, therefore, supply as much quantity as we need in order to be able to carry on our work, the Government, especially, to carry on the administration and see that law and order are maintained without causing disaffection.

"Then, Sir, I take up the other side. What is to be our future policy? What have the Government to speak of about the future? When we take up the question of future food production in this State, we have to look into what is called 'intensive production schemes'. It is worthwhile examining how far these schemes are likely to increase our production so that to a greater extent we may not be required to rely on the Government of India or help from outside. One of the suggestions which has been made in connection with these schemes is to increase the price of foodgrains so that it may prove an incentive for the ryot to grow more food. It may be asked, 'where is the money to come from; we cannot charge the consumer any more; already we have reached the limit'. Yes, I quite agree. But, Sir, the Government of India have been giving what are called bonuses in respect of food procured. What have we done with these bonuses? They must have been used for the benefit of the producer as well as the consumer. On the other hand, we find that the bonuses have not been utilized for that purpose. Yesterday I elicited from the Hon. the Food Minister in answer to an interpellation certain information which goes to show that these bonuses have accumulated so much as to amount to crores. What have we done with that amount? Why not we allow a portion of it to go back to the producer? I plead, Sir, in that direction there is great scope for increased production. It will afford sufficient incentive to the producer and if the Government of India have to be consulted in the matter, let them be told that we are using the bonuses in a way directly to produce more food by giving encouragement to the ryots. I do not want to quote figures here as they were given only yesterday but I would like the Hon. the Food Minister to examine this aspect of the question. Even a little increase in the price may prove a great encouragement to the food-grower.

[Sri R. Suryanarayana Rao] [2nd September 1950]

"We are talking of extensive and intensive cultivation. I am told that intensive cultivation is advocated as it is likely to produce results much more quickly than extensive cultivation and the various long-term irrigation and other projects. Again, yesterday, Sir, I put a question which you were pleased to convert into an unstarred question—and it is good because I got a lot of information—to find out how far the hydro and thermal electricity produced in this State is being used for purposes of irrigation. Here I have got the answer. While the production of hydro-thermal energy is increasing, the amount given for irrigation purposes is decreasing though the number of pump sets is increasing! In the year 1948-49, 13.6 per cent—12.5 per cent of the hydro-electric energy and 1.1 per cent of thermal energy—was being used for irrigation purposes and in 1949-50, the total consumption came down to 13.3 per cent. Let us take the number of pump sets. The number of pump sets was 2,212 in 1948-49 and it rose to 2,607 in 1949-50. What I am pleading is unless more energy and more pump sets are made available to the ryots, the prospect of increasing food production is remote.

"Then I come to the distribution of chemical manures. I also put a similar question about it and the Government were pleased to give an answer to that unstarred question. The quantity of chemical manure, imported and indigenous, was 156,000 tons in 1949-50 excluding the 40 per cent of the production of the Fertilizers and Chemicals of Travancore. Let me add this 40 per cent; in that case the total quantity may go up to 166,000 or 170,000 tons. Out of this, it is stated in the appendix to the answer, about one lakh tons have been allotted to the different districts of the State. I ask, what has happened to the remaining quantity, about 60,000 tons? If it is given to what are called the manure mixture firms, for what purpose they are using these manures? Secondly in 1949-50, only 25,758 tons were distributed through the agricultural depots. I do not know what the exact allotment to the depots was. Anyway it must be about 64,000 tons. I want to know whether the remaining quantity was distributed through the distributing firms. If that is so, how much quantity has been distributed straight as fertilizers for purposes of increasing production? What is happening to-day is most of the stuff is going into the hands of those who use it not for food production but for other crops. (An hon. Member: 'Commercial crops'. Commercial crops as an hon. Member suggests. Is it not possible to see that sufficient quantities of sulphate are put into the hands of the ryots so that food may be grown in greater quantities? That will help us to tide over the situation we face at present as far as possible without the help of the Central Government by way of imports and doles. For the year 1950-51 through which we are passing now, the Government have made some arrangements for the distribution of fertilizers. May I know, Sir, whether the Government would see now at least, having seen how the distribution has taken place in the past, that these chemical manures

2nd September 1950] [Sri R. Suryanarayana Rao]

which are so badly needed for food production are distributed among food producers only? I am glad that the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture is present in the House and I would beg of him to concentrate and see that every particle of ammonium sulphate that is available is utilized for this purpose. Such demands as of planters and others may be met to the extent that is absolutely necessary.

"I know, Sir, the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture is paying visits to different parts of the State to see how far this intensive scheme that has been introduced in nine districts is being pursued with the zeal and energy necessary. I would like more visits not only by the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture but by the Food Minister and others being made in order that they may sit tight on the staff to execute the scheme quickly so that there may be no complaints from the ryots that the manures they want are not available for them, or the pump sets they require are not supplied. Unless this is done, there is no prospect, as I have said, of this State ever becoming independent of the Government of India or for that matter of any other State. We will always be going abegging and if we have to import foodgrains on our own account, perhaps we may have to spend much more than we can afford. Yesterday, I drew the attention of the Government to this state of things. It might be that the figures supplied to me were revealing to the Hon. the Ministers themselves when they were placed before them. What is past is past. See that in future every effort is made to increase food production . . ."

MR. CHAIRMAN :—"As there are a number of hon. Members to speak on this motion, I would like the hon. Member to be brief."

SRI R. SURYANARAYANA RAO :—"I have nothing more to say, Sir. I second the amendment moved by my hon. Friend, Mr. Narayanaswami Nayudu."

JANAB K. T. M. AHMED IBRAHIM :—"Mr. Chairman, we get periodical reports and periodical statistics about the food situation, but the common man is not concerned with reports and statistics; he only wants food. I shall deal with the question from the point of view of the common man. Sir, this Government have given some statistics and the Central Government also have given some statistics. Last time when the Assembly met, the Hon. the Food Minister issued a statement giving certain statistics. The refrain of the whole statement was that this State did not receive the promised allotments from the Central Government and hence there was distress in the State. But soon after, the Central Food Minister said that the scarcity in this Province was a myth and that there was enough food here and that the so-called starvation deaths about which there was much talk in the other House and even tears were shed, were a myth. Then our Chief Minister and the Food Minister went to Delhi to acquaint the Government of India with the situation here and get us more food. What happened afterwards? The Hon. the Food Minister said that our State

[Janab K. T. M. Ahmed Ibrahim] [2nd September 1950]

has turned the corner. Within a few days of his stating that there is distress in this State, he has stated that we have turned the corner. How we have turned the corner, I do not know. At the same time he admitted that not a single grain more was allotted by the Central Government. How then could we have turned the corner? The common man is in the same position as before, because he is not getting more than what he was getting. The rural population is not getting even the 6 ounces; it is only allotted and promised 6 ounces. I do not know whether the rural population actually get the 6 ounces of rice and overall ration of 12 ounces. I am yet to see whether in any part of the State people get 12 ounces including rice and millets. When these people go to the ration shops, they are told that there is rice only and not wheat or millets. They are asked to take whatever is available. There have been many complaints about it. The Government have not remedied the situation.

Now, Sir, what is the real position in the State? The statistics show that the grains procured and the stocks in the districts at present do not meet the needs of the population. We are concentrating only on the statutorily rationed areas. What about the informal rationing areas and about areas where there is not even informal rationing? The Government take away the rice from the producers and ask them to shift for themselves. There is no free trade in rice and wherefrom are the people to get the rice they want? The Government say they are not bound to supply rice to the informal rationing areas, but wherefrom are they to get rice if the Government take away the rice produced in those areas for feeding the urban population? They cannot get rice from outside the State. How are they to get rice and how are they to live? In statutorily rationed areas in some places, only 2 ounces are given. I am not very much concerned with the figures. Mr. Narayanaswami Nayudu has dealt with the figures as he always does. But what is the present position of the State? Do people get what they want? Are they properly fed? The Government speak of self-sufficiency by 1951. They must aim at a thing which is possible and practicable. There is no use of saying that we must have self-sufficiency by 1951. Is it possible so far as this State is concerned? The Government estimate the deficit at 8 lakhs of tons. It is an under-estimate. Year before last it was estimated at 12 lakhs of tons. Now when the monsoon has failed and when there are so many other difficulties, it is still estimated at 8 lakhs of tons. When you say that you do not give an imaginary figure, you go on the statistics and estimate your deficit at 8 lakhs of tons. But when you ask the Central Government to give 8 lakhs of tons, they agree to give only 3 lakhs of tons. On what basis do they say that? Do they not trust you and your figures? You submit your demands but they do not take you at your word. The Central Food Minister comes here to examine the whole question on the spot. He goes to certain villages and the villagers are asked, 'Have you got food?' They show their ration cards and say that they have ration cards only but no food. He turns round to

[2nd September 1950] [Janab K. T. M. Ahmed Ibrahim]

the Chief Minister and he in turn asks the Commissioner of Civil Supplies. The Commissioner says that it is all they could give. I saw this in the Press. The Commissioner of Civil Supplies said that that was the only thing they could give them. Now what are they to do with the ration cards? After seeing this state of affairs the Central Food Minister goes to Delhi and says there is enough stock in Madras and there is no difficulty there. Till to-day I have not seen the reply of this Government to the statement of the Central Minister for Food that there is enough stock in Madras and there is no difficulty. If there is enough stock in Madras why is it not given to the people? Why do they suffer? Do they suffer wantonly? Do they refuse to purchase foodgrains even though they are available in ration shops? Have you not heard stories of ration shops being closed for days and weeks? Are they all false? Still the Hon. the Food Minister of the Central Government says in Parliament that there is enough food in Madras and that the stories of distress and starvation deaths are all false. Have not this Government enquired into them? The difficulties were stated by responsible members of the Legislature on the floor of the other House. When the Central Government Food Minister says that it is all a myth, is it not the duty of this Government to vindicate the honour of the legislators? If they find that it is false, let them issue a statement. They ought to have said that on the floor of the House.

"Sir our Ministers go to Delhi and return empty handed. But they say that we have turned the corner. Have we turned the corner, Sir? Do the people receive enough foodgrains? Do they have one square meal a day? I am not speaking of the rural population. Let us take at least the people in the statutorily rationed areas. The whole thing seems to be this: the Central Government are not prepared to believe this State Government. After elaborate work, the Government estimate the requirements here. They even under-estimate the requirements and say that they want 8 lakhs of tons. But the Central Government say that they would give only 3 lakhs of tons. What is this bargaining for? Is it not the duty of the Central Government to trust the words of the State Governments? Why should they send their Food Minister here first and then their officers to examine the veracity of the statements of the State Government? That is how you are being treated. In the end we get two lakhs or one lakh of tons. What about the rest? How are the people to live in this State? With all that you take things lying down and say that everything is all right and there is nothing wrong with the Central Government. How are you going to meet the situation? Whatever the Government may say, the distress is there. Every day we are receiving reports of distress in the villages and the towns. Even the statistics given by the Food Secretary do not show that the stock position is such that even the statutorily rationed areas will have enough stock for a number of weeks. At best, they have stocks only for a few days. Are you doing to get something from the Central Government to meet the deficit or are

[Janab K. T. M. Ahmed Ibrahim] [2nd September 1950]

you going to allow the people to do what they like? Even then you do not allow them to keep what they produce. That is taken away from them. They cannot get anything internally. Sir, even a small island like Ceylon has been able to give us a loan of 10,000 tons. It is not a producer country, but it has been able to anticipate the winter and secure sufficient quantity in advance. That small island is able to lend us 10,000 tons. I am really ashamed to see that we must go a begging with the beggar's bowl in hand even to such a small island as Ceylon. If we had only anticipated these difficulties, could we not have secured sufficient quantities already? You have been thinking of some fictitious self-sufficiency in 1951. You have been simply repeating the mantra of self-sufficiency, that you should have enough food in the country and that there should be no necessity to import food from elsewhere. By all means concentrate on it. But you must look to the immediate needs of the people and see that the people do not starve. You must not wait until there are starvation deaths. People do not die of starvation at once. As a matter of fact, the population is being emaciated on account of malnutrition and under-nourishment. In course of time people will die a premature death, because you have not been able to give them sufficient food-grains.

"Sir, we have been urging from the beginning about the price of foodgrains. Everyone knows that the prices of all commodities except rice have increased enormously."

MR. CHAIRMAN :—"The hon. Member may give his suggestions as to how the Government should meet the situation."

JANAB K. T. M. AHMED IBRAHIM :—"My first suggestion is about the price of foodgrains. When the prices of all commodities have terribly increased, there must be a proportionate increase in the price of rice also. That alone will induce the ryot to part with the surplus grains, because from the income he gets from his land, he has to buy all the other necessities of life. When he is not able to do that, he has no incentive to cultivate and part with the surplus grains at controlled rates. Hence there is black-market. The other day I was informally talking to an officer of the Government and he said that the price of rice varied from State to State. We paid Rs. 108 lakhs more for the rice we got from Uttar Pradesh, and that was justified by the Central Government as that was the ruling price in Uttar Pradesh. The ruling price in Uttar Pradesh is higher than the price in Madras. I ask, Sir: Why not give the same price to the ryot in Madras? When you import rice from some country outside the Indian Union you pay much more.

3-45
p.m.

"If the ryot in other States is receiving more money for the rice he produces, why not you give the same price to our own people and thus induce them to cultivate more? Because of necessity he has to spend all his money on cultivation and then lose as a result of his cultivation; that is a matter which this Government has to look into.

2nd September 1950] [Janab K. T. M. Ahmed Ibrahim]

“Sir, it is agreed that people must anyhow be fed. You should not always be thinking of self-sufficiency; if there is the necessity you must be prepared to import from outside. There is no question of our people being made to starve for want of food; our people are accustomed only to rice; you cannot dump wheat on them. No doubt, some people may take wheat, but so far as the general population is concerned, they are accustomed to eating only rice, and it is your duty to make rice available to them in time. If you wait till the last minute and want to purchase rice from other countries later on, perhaps you may not be able to get the necessary quantity, or if you get it, you will have to pay a higher price for it than what you will have to pay if you buy now, and the result will be that we will be losers to a great extent. I would therefore appeal to the Government not to be always thinking of self-sufficiency; let them think of the immediate needs also and get our requirements from outside the country. We must even compel the Central Government to import whatever quantity is necessary from outside the country.

“As regards the long-range plan, you have of course so many projects. I should like to draw the attention of Government to the recent statement made by our President, the hon. Babu Rajendra Prasad. He has given a timely warning to this and the other State Governments. We have been speaking of chemical manures; he said that if chemical manures are used, the soil will become exhausted and therefore we must pay due consideration to the views of the ryots who have developed, through centuries of hard experience, a particular method of cultivation. You should try to supplement that method and not replace that method. True it is that the yield in other countries is three or four times the yield in our country, and it is high time our Government think of finding out methods which would make the ryots cultivate and produce more, adopting scientific methods which would result in a higher yield. But your method should be such as to supplement their present method and not make them adopt the methods followed in other countries, which according to the statement of our President, would exhaust the soil in a short time and would be disastrous to the productive capacity of the land. I appeal to the Government to think of the entire population of the country, not only urban but also rural, and see that the quantity of foodgrains which they get from outside and also as a result of procurement internally, is distributed among all. Very often it is said that we must speed up and intensify procurement; but the officers coming from the Central Government have repeatedly said that procurement in this State is the best in the whole country. You have adopted all sorts of methods here. The other day the hon. Mr. Gopala Reddi said that since procurement has become chronic, you should not complain of hardships, police zoolum, etc. Procurement has therefore gone to that extent, and you have been making the maximum procurement in this State. In spite of all that, how can you expect sufficient foodgrains to cover the deficit which is sufficiently a large one?”

[2nd September 1950]

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“ There are a number of hon. Members who wish to speak; I request the hon. Member to close.”

JANAB K. T. M. IBRAHIM :—“ I shall try to be short, Sir.”

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“ I see from the proceedings of the other day that there was a suggestion that the House might sit even after five o'clock to-day. I should like to know the wishes of the Members, whether we should sit beyond five.”

THE HON. SRI K. MADHAVA MENON :—“ It is true, Sir, that when the request for a debate was made, the Government said there was hardly time for it and that we would have to take it up, if necessary, after lunch to-day; incidentally it was also stated that if it was found necessary, we might sit for some time after five to-day. But I find that most of our members are going away to-day because there may not be a meeting again for a short time to come. Therefore, Sir, I am afraid it will be inconvenient to sit beyond five. Moreover, we did not at that time, anticipate some of the engagements we have had to fix for this evening. I would suggest, Sir, if that is possible, it would be better to finish at the usual time.”

SRI B. NARAYANASWAMI NAYUDU :—“ May I suggest that if the debate is left unfinished by five o'clock, we may take it over to the next day when the Council meets?”

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“ The question is whether we should rise to-day at 5 o'clock or afterwards.”

JANAB K. UPPI :—“ Mr. Chairman, this day we have asked for and we have remained here only to discuss the food situation. We were made to understand that we would get some time more than the usual 2½ hours of the afternoon. The food position is a special problem; I would like the House to sit an hour or two more, as many of us here would like to give vent to our feelings in the matter.”

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“ Let us see which is better, whether to finish at 5 or to sit afterwards. I thought it would be better to fix a time. I would certainly like to give as much time as hon. Members want, but if we are to sit till 7 or 7-30, it may not be quite convenient. That is why I wanted to know when we should rise. Perhaps if each member takes not more than ten minutes, we may be able to finish. I have got before me the names of three members who wish to speak. May I know how many more members want to speak? If Mr. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliyar is going to speak, may I know how long he would take?”

DR. A. LAKSHMANASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—“ About fifteen minutes, Sir.”

JANAB K. UPPI :—“ I would speak only for about ten minutes, Sir; I do not make long speeches.”

2nd September 1950]

JANAB ABDUL LATIF FAROOKHI :—" I would also speak for about fifteen minutes, Sir."

MR. CHAIRMAN :—" I think it is better to fix ten minutes as the maximum for each speaker. Mr. Ibrahim may now resume his seat at any rate he need not rise again." (Laughter.)

JANAB K. T. M. AHMED IBRAHIM :—" I do not remember, Sir, where I left. Therefore, I would appeal to the Government again not to concentrate on the so-called self-sufficiency plan, but try to influence the Central Government to import the necessary quantity of rice for us and not to make this rice scarcity a bargaining counter for the people—whether they will take rice or wheat or other things. The people must have what they want. Without a sufficient supply of food, the country cannot progress and ultimately only disaster will overtake the country and its people."

SRI MOTHEY NARAYANA RAO :—" Mr. Chairman, Sir I am glad to hear that the Food Minister is not so pessimistic as he was at the time he made his last statement in the Assembly; but I do not know if he is optimistic now. From pessimism, he has come to optimism now. I would like to hear, if he is optimistic, whether he would raise the rice ration from 6 oz. to 10 oz. shortly. Sir, the tale of woe is uniform throughout the State. Even a district like the West Godavari district which is supposed to be a surplus district from which we export some lakhs of tons of rice every year to deficit districts, is not excluded from the difficulties. The Hon. Minister for Food some time ago made a statement that in all surplus districts, 10 oz. of ration will be retained for the people and the surplus alone will be taken outside the district. But what we see to-day is that we also get 6 oz. and no more; that is the case in a surplus district like West Godavari which ordinarily exports rice to other districts. And what kind of rice? Sometimes very bad rice: it may be 6 oz. of rice, but the actual contents would be only 3 to 4 oz. We have seen some samples that have been supplied by the ration shops. In the last Food Committee meeting, my hon. friend Mr. Govindachari produced a sample and had shown it to the Collector. It contained 40 to 50 per cent of dust and husk. So, this 6 oz. ration is only a myth; we actually get only 3 to 4 oz. and not 6 oz. Even then, the ration shops are not open throughout the week; they are open only for two or three days of the week. In the rural areas especially, in some of the upland taluks, where there is informal rationing, rice is not supplied regularly. For three or four days in the week ration shops are closed because there is no stock. That is the case in a surplus district. What is it all due to? The District Collector says we have plenty of stock; but still, we don't get the needs supplied through the ration shops, although we have the ration cards. I do not know how the Hon. Minister is going to account for these things. Perhaps he will attribute it to the inefficiency or callousness of the officials concerned. But whatever it is, it is a tale of woe. It may be said, Sir, that there is no danger of starvation of the people. I know, Sir, that people have not died of starvation, but I know there have been cases of

[Sri Mothey Narayana Rao] [2nd September 1950]

starvation. Recently, the Hon. Food Minister toured some of our districts and procured about 70,000 bags of paddy from rich cultivators and influential people. But I would like to know if the Hon. Minister cared to go to the villages and ask the opinion of the illiterate masses whether they have been getting their food. The illiterate people there would have told him, I am sure, that they have been starving at least once a week, because they are not able to get sufficient quantity of rice. This is the state of things existing in our district, in the rural areas. I would appeal to the Hon. Food Minister to see that at least in the surplus districts he gives 10 oz. of rice for the people according to the statement he made some time ago and take only the balance to the other districts. I agree there are deficit districts and we have to help them to the maximum extent possible, even if we go against the proverb 'charity begins at home'; we have to make some sacrifice in order to help our brethren in the other districts. That is one side of the question, but as I said, that sacrifice should not be by making the people actually starve after giving whatever they have.

Various suggestions have been made, Sir, as to how to get over the situation. We have had practical suggestions, impractical suggestions, theoretical suggestions, etc., as to how we should get over the crisis in the State. The Government, I believe, are examining every one of them. Some people say that by giving more facilities to the ryots, by improving tanks and giving greater irrigation facilities and also by supplying more manure, the situation can be got over. Some other people say that by intensive cultivation, that is, by making the ryots produce eleven bags of paddy where they produce only ten bags now, the situation can be got over, and you will not be feeling much food difficulty at all. Whether we should follow the method of giving more irrigation facilities, digging more tanks and more wells for the ryots for irrigation purposes, and infuse greater enthusiasm in the ryots to grow more food or whether we should encourage them to take to intensive cultivation is a matter which I leave it to the Government to decide. For my part, I think both these methods can be examined and adopted simultaneously. But which is to be taken up first is the question? My own view is that by intensive cultivation, things would improve a great deal. The ryot must be given greater encouragement, he must be given all the facilities; all his needs must be met promptly and quickly. Then only he will be able to produce more food. Now, the ryot is most dissatisfied with the present system of Government, because he is not able to get his demands fulfilled from the hands of the officials of the Government.

4 p.m.

There is also another thing in regard to this matter. The ryot must have some interest in the land so that he may be able to produce more food. As we stand to-day, we have got the agricultural labourer and the tenant that takes the land on tenure who cultivates the land for the sake of another man. A larger proportion of the people are agricultural labourers and also tenants who take the land on lease and these people do not have much

2nd September 1950] [Sri Mothey Narayana Rao]

interest in the land as we stand to-day. For instance, a person who owns lands in Ellore and lives in Madras, gives his land on lease to somebody, and he cultivates the land, puts a lot of money, ploughs the land and goes through all the agricultural operations and what is the return that he gets for all his labour and money? Two-thirds or sometimes three-fourths is taken away by the person who owns the land, and only one-third or one-fourth is left to the man who actually tills the soil with the sweat of the brow and puts all his investment on that land. So, where is the enthusiasm for the person who actually tills the land? I am sorry to note that even the Congress Ministry which has been in office for over four years, have not been able to protect the man that tills the soil. The Great Mahatma said, that whoever toils at the sweat of his brow must get the benefit of this effort. But, where are we to-day? Land has not been distributed accordingly. I still believe there should be a redistribution of land; this capitalist mentality should go. But, at least till that is done, can they not protect the man that takes the land on lease? Can they not by one piece of legislation say that the man who really toils and works hard and produces more food, gets at least half the produce. I think the real basis of distribution should be that the man that really toils should get the whole benefit of his labour. If we cannot do it all at a time, can we not at least see that the person who actually tills the land shall be in possession of the land for, say, five or ten years at least, so that he need not be at the mercy of anybody. The point is, he should not be asked to go away the next year leaving the land, after doing such hard work, to the landlord. Also what proportion of the produce he should be entitled to get should also be fixed. If this Government cannot do even such a small thing as that, where is the enthusiasm for the ryot, I ask? Having put in all his labour, he gets only one-third which is hardly sufficient to meet his expenses. Because the man is poor, he is satisfied with what little he gets. I know there are cases where the ryots are satisfied with two bandy-loads of grass. For the labour he puts in for cultivating the land, what is the return? Two bandy-loads of grass. That is all he gets for his labour. This state of things is really very deplorable. So, I would request the Government to take up this question immediately, because they have been promising to do it for a very long time. If they cannot do it all in one day, if they cannot pass a legislation to that effect, they can at least by an Ordinance protect the man who works on the land.

“Again, Sir, there is the rich landlord who is afraid of the legislation that may be coming up some time afterwards in regard to agrarian reform. He thinks his home farm land will not be disturbed and wants to cultivate it himself, because if he does not cultivate it himself it would be taken away from him and distributed. Suppose, I own some lands given to me by my great grandfather, say hundred acres of land. I do not know how to cultivate or how to plough the land. In fact, I do not know how to handle the plough. All of a sudden thinking that, if I do not cultivate all the land, the land will be taken away from me, I engage

[Sri Mothey Narayana Rao] [2nd September 1950]

servants and begin to cultivate the land with hired labour. Because I am not a practical agriculturist, surely the produce will not be much, but it will go down. Unless a man is an agriculturist, he will not be able to command an agricultural labourer. Simply because one is afraid that if he does not cultivate the land himself, he will be deprived of the land, even though he is having his big business in Bombay, wants to take possession of the land and begins to cultivate it, it will only result in a loss to him. I know of many people owning hundreds of acres and who have taken to such cultivation have lost. I say, it is not only a loss to the persons concerned, but it is a loss to the State and to the actual labourer. That is why, the labourer has become very indifferent and he has become more indifferent after the preachings of the Communists. I think, my hon. Friend has put it plainly when he said that he does not work hard but wants more. That is why the yield per acre is deteriorating. That is why I say, this state of things should not be allowed to continue for long. There must be some drastic remedy. If really you want to solve the food problem, you must take courage in your hands and see that proper distribution of land is made.

"Sir, let us see what Mahatma Gandhi has said. He said that the land belongs to God and whoever toils should have the benefit of it. That is what the Mahatma has said. He has won freedom for us. What for? It does not mean that we should occupy positions of advantage and sit here. He wanted that the villages should be made self-sufficient. Not only that, but that every individual should be clothed and fed. What is it that is happening? The villager does not have even a morsel of food. But there is the Congress at the head of the administration and yet you give the villager only so much of food. If you ask him, why not produce food and help the Government; he can do that only if you give him land so that he can become self-sufficient. You must therefore make every village self-sufficient. You must tell them, you are responsible to feed your people. Mother nature is devised in such a way that every part of the country will be self-sufficient in food. You must insist on the people and tell them that every part of the country should be self-sufficient in food, so that commercial and money crops should go. The basis of society as envisaged by the Great Mahatma is self-sufficiency in food and clothing. So, every individual must work, toil and produce; otherwise he has no business to eat and live at the mercy of another. That is the idea of the classless society aimed at by the Congress. I would like to ask the Ministry whether they have got that motto of the Congress before them. If so, I ask, what have they done for classless society? I ask, do you not stand for a classless society according to the manifesto issued by the Congress to the people? If you do, what have you done? I say you have not done anything except sitting idle. I say you are not acting up to the ideal. According to the manifesto which you placed before the country, redistribution of land is the first thing. Burma has done it; Kashmir has done it and let Madras start it. That is the only remedy to solve the food situation in

2nd September 1950] [Sri Mothey Narayana Rao]

the country. I would therefore appeal to the Government to take up the question of agrarian reform which they have been promising for such a long time and act boldly and quickly and see that land is distributed."

MR. CHAIRMAN :—" I hope the hon. Member will finish soon."

SRI MOTHEY NARAYANA RAO :—" Yes, Sir. I think that begging the Central Government and doing things like procurement should go. If you want to improve the State you should see that every individual is made self-sufficient; every village should be made self-sufficient and every district should be made self-sufficient. If that motto is worked out, I think the food situation will be solved; otherwise there will be trouble everywhere and the food situation can never be solved."

JANAB ABDUL LATIF FAROOKHI :—" Sir, I may point out that we have come to an understanding . . ."

MR. CHAIRMAN :—" Only on this side? "

JANAB ABDUL LATIF FAROOKHI :—" No, Sir, on both sides, that the discussion on this subject should be continued on the next day also."

THE HON. SRI K. MADHAVA MENON :—" I am agreeable to Mr. Narayanaswami Nayudu's suggestion that it may be continued the next day, but since we are sitting and discussing it for two or three hours, I think, we may be able to finish the discussion; if not, it can continue on the next day on which the Council meets."

JANAB ABDUL LATIF FAROOKHI :—" In that case, Sir, I request more time may be allowed to members to speak."

MR. CHAIRMAN :—" I have no objection. But, from the discussion I see that not much time is necessary because the same points are raised over and over again. I think what the Government want from the hon. Members is a remedy for the present situation. I do not think the Government are so dense as not to know what is happening in the country, but what they would like to have is, suggestions or counter-suggestions as to how the situation can be met. I hope, it should be possible for every member to finish his speech in ten minutes. I think the hon. Mr. Uppi Sahib gave notice of an adjournment motion the other day about this. He may now go on."

JANAB K. UPPI :—" Mr. Chairman, Sir, the present food situation in the country demands the attention of each and every one of us. The food position in the country is bad; it is very bad. I say, it is on the brink of collapse. In the villages, the situation is very deplorable and it is really heart-rending. Many of the members of this House are from towns where there is statutory rationing and they get at least 6 oz. of rice and some other food materials, but in villages the position is very deplorable. In Malabar, for instance, in many of the villages for the last three weeks or so, they have been getting only 3 or 4 days ration at 6 oz.

[Janab K. Uppl] [2nd September 1950]

of course they might be getting 3 oz. of wheat also. But most of the poor people do not know how to use wheat. They say, continuous use of wheat brings stomach-ache and other difficulties for them. If I tell you some of the scenes I have seen—it is really heart-rending”

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“ I hope the hon. Member will spare us that ordeal.”

JANAB K. UPPI :—“ I wish I could. I am putting it before those who can concentrate their attention so that they can put their shoulders to the wheel and do what they can to solve the problem. That is all I want. What I suggest is this. The hon. Mr. Suryanarayana Rao was telling that there was a shortage of 18 lakhs tons of foodstuffs in the country even from normal days. If that was the only shortage in respect of rice, paddy or millets, I say we are not short of it now, because in those days rice, paddy and cereals were used for feeding the cattle, whereas we are using them now. Now each one of us is restricting our food because we are getting only 6 oz.

4-15 p.m. “ So in that way the 18 lakhs of tons must have been made up and based on that calculation, we must not be short of food materials in this country. But somehow or other, the country is actually short of food. I say, Sir, that it is not because of increase in population. But somewhere there is some defect in the supply of food and I do not know whether the policy of the Government lies at the root of it or whether it is the policy of the people. I should say that it is the policy of the Government. Mr. Chairman, Sir, you asked me what we are to do to immediately tide over the difficult situation and what my suggestion was. So far as the immediate steps are concerned, I would suggest to the Government to modify their control policy in a realistic way and not in an idealistic manner. The Government are saying: The people shall eat only so much; the people shall part with their produce for so much and we shall not pay a pie more than that. But I ask them: Get from them at the price at which you are selling in the ration shops or even a little more and induce the producer and encourage the producer to part with his produce. The producer has domestic needs and social needs to meet and you are asking him to sell to the Government at a price which is very un-attractive to him. The wages of his coolie, the cost of things essential for his existence have all risen and so the price that the Government pay is not sufficient for him. Besides this, there is this human psychology working in his mind. You take at Rs. 20 from him and just under his very nose you sell the same thing to his neighbour at the rate of Rs. 27-8-0. He is a human being and he sees that the things taken from him at Rs. 20 are sold to a next door neighbour for Rs. 27-8-0 when he has every chance of selling it to him at the same rate without the intervention of the Government. You also use force and try to get the grains from him. Just ponder over it and say what his feelings would be. In Switzerland, they give more to their own cultivators than they pay for their imported grains and the State bears the loss. You may ask how the State can afford to go on like that. I say,

2nd September 1950] [Janab K. Uppi]

Sir, ultimately that will not be a loss as the cultivator will put all his energy, his enthusiasm and diligence into his work of producing more and he will produce more. Tomorrow you pay him an economic price and I assure you, Sir, that within a week all the rice that is lying in the country will come out. It has been said that if the price of rice and paddy were increased, the price of other things necessary for human existence will also increase. But, Sir, the price of other articles have risen in spite of all your preventive efforts and the cultivator is not able to stand it and what is his next step? He puts it under and sells it in the black-market. If you want a substantial quantity of foodgrains to come to you, I suggest you declare that instead of the bonus, which is actually given to 5 per cent of the people who do not know how to utilize it and it actually lapses to the Government, you will give the producer an economic price and you will be able to see the effect in a short time. Another thing that I wish to bring to the notice of the Government is that the Government are using force to procure rice and paddy from the people. I feel, Sir, it is a dangerous thing. For obvious reasons with a certain section of the people, namely criminals, the Police are not very popular. Recently Police force was used, I do not know at whose instance it was done; if it is with the consent of the Government, I must say that they stand self-condemned. The Government appealed to the people and their response has been handsome. Recently the Hon. Minister for Food went to the Northern districts and as a result of his appeal to the producers, we obtained a large quantity of foodgrains and also when the Hon. Mr. Bhaktavatsalam went to Tanjore, he appealed to the mirasdars and they parted with a large quantity of foodstuffs. If you use force, so long as human psychology is what it is, the more you use force the worse will be the food position in the State. You are spending crores of money for increasing production for your anicuts and canals; you must also spend crores on the only great factor which is human co-operation. Your anicuts, your irrigation schemes and pump sets are not going to yield results and give you food unless the co-operation of the people is there. You do not seem to want human co-operation but you are trying to force human beings to co-operate with you. Forcing people is not co-operation. On the other hand, you must induce the people, encourage the people to produce more. Their co-operation is absolutely essential to make all these investments fruitful; otherwise it will be a waste of public funds. These are schemes which will yield results in 1953, 62 or 72 for our successors; successors there will be only if we outlive the present difficult position. Therefore, it is necessary that all our energies must be utilized towards self-preservation and along with starting the Malampuzha scheme and other schemes in the land, a portion of that money must be used to pay the cultivators so that it will induce them to produce more, to put more manure, more energy and bring more waste lands under the plough. Instead of doing that, what is the use of making profit in these transactions? You should give them substantially more than what you are selling at. Instead of that we see you are turning out to be merchants, not full-blown ones but half merchants, trying to make profit and

[Janab K. Uppi] [2nd September 1950]

calling it a profit what has been justly due to the cultivator. I can say for certain that such a thing is obtaining in Malabar; for every twenty rupees worth of foodgrains that they are purchasing, they clear a profit of Rs. 7½. Why not you pay him Rs. 30 and get the grains from him; that will induce him, I am sure, not only to part with whatever is possible for him but also he will co-operate with you and produce more and more in the years to come. That is what I would submit to the Government to tide over the present position.

"I would like to bring to the notice of the Government the fact that force and coercion is used and harassment is resorted to by the officers in charge of procurement."

MR. CHAIRMAN :—"The hon. Member has already referred to it."

JANAB K. UPPI :—"I did not refer to what actually happened, Sir. The Police force went and surrounded a village. I read in the papers that the Hon. the Minister for Finance said in the other House that there was no harassment. Surrounding the whole village from 6 o'clock in the morning to 7 o'clock in the night and searching the houses, is it not harassment, Sir? Is it not keeping all the people in the village terror-stricken for the whole day? Is it not harassment? If it is not harassment, I do not know what else can it be? Probably what he meant was that they were not beaten with lathis; there was no lathi charge and according to him harassment means lathi charge. I must say, Sir, that it ill becomes any Government to use the Police force for these purposes. It must be used when there is a dangerous breach of peace. In conclusion, Sir, I would urge upon the Government to give more to the actual cultivator and induce him to cultivate more."

DR. A. LAKSHMANASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—"Mr. Chairman, Sir, during the past few years, time and again we have had to debate in this House the question of food supply in the Province. I realize that there have been in recent years many disastrous consequences due to nature which has affected the food position. The failure of rains, the cyclone havoc and floods have been responsible for the short supply of the expected or anticipated supply of foodgrains in the Province. But I am afraid, Sir, that we have not taken hold of the fundamental position as it were. There was no such scarcity even during the war years and it may be asked why is it that now when there is no war and things should have settled, every time and every year, or even twice a year sometimes, we have debated this question of food. Sir, from the Report which was presented to the Government of India by the Famine Enquiry Commission, it will be abundantly clear that the Madras State was always a deficit State in point of food and what they had been doing was that they imported foodgrains from Burma which was the chief country from which we imported. Of course there were other countries from which we could import when necessary. That policy is the policy which saved Madras from many of the disastrous consequences whether it was due to nature's unfriendly acts or due to the fact that Madras was not in a position

2nd September 1950] [Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliyar]

to do so. The food question has to be looked at from two points of view, the immediate point of view how to tide over the present difficulty this year—I won't say the long term policy—because we are going to be pursued with the same difficulties and the same disastrous consequence in the coming year also and let not hon. Members think that there is any miracle that is going to happen even with the best of Nature's conditions by which the State will have an abundant supply of all the foodgrains that it requires. This is a deficit State and will require foodgrains to be supplied from other quarters. That is a point which people have got to realize. I come to the immediate question. In a debate that took place on the 13th August 1948, the Hon. the Food Minister gave the following figures. He said—

‘Then, Sir, doubts have been expressed about our stock position. I want to assure hon. Members that our stock position is satisfactory. Remarks have been made that this report was made a month ago. Naturally, I cannot be expected to publish reports every day. It has been stated in the other House and I have stated the facts to this House also now. I would like to point out that our stock on 31—7—1948, that is, from the beginning of August, has been 341,902 tons of rice, wheat 16,838 tons, maida 2,767 tons, maize 27,527 tons and other grains 12,786 tons. So, on the whole, you will find that on the 1st August our stock position was 401,820 tons. Then, what we except from the Government of India is this 57,447 tons of rice from what has been promised is yet to come : wheat 18,224 tons ; maize 1,335 tons and other grains 46,648 tons. So, we are expecting a total of 123,654 tons and if we add that to our stock on hand, our stock would be 525,474 tons.’

4-30
p.m.

That, Sir, was the position in the beginning of August 1948.

Then, the Hon. Minister goes on to say—

‘At the present rate of offtake referred to by Mr. Suryanarayana Rao on account of the number of relief shops, our stock position will last till the end of October 1948.’

Now, let us remember, that with 525 thousand and odd tons on hand, we expected our stock position will last till the end of October 1948. Now, I turn to another statement presented by Government to the Assembly, I think, about the end of last month, in which it was stated—

‘The scale of rice ration, therefore, still stands at 7 ounces in the towns’

That was a long time back. Much water has flown down the bridge since then; and now it is six ounces. The statement goes on to say—

‘but it would be impossible to maintain this scale any longer. The stock of rice on 29th July 1950 was only 114,785 tons. Adding to them, 150,000 tons likely to be procured before the end of October and 60,000 tons which we might receive under the Basio plan, our total availabilities will amount to about 325,000 tons. Out of this, about a lakh of tons at least should be kept as buffer at the end of October. The balance available for distribution during the interval is only about 2.25 lakhs of tons’

Sir, this is against the 525,474 tons in 1948, and yet we are asked to believe, this year, the food situation is not bad and we have tided over the situation, with facts such as this facing at us! On this particular occasion, compared to two years ago, we have only half the stock, and if we are going to have ration still reduced, I can only say that those responsible hardly realise the disastrous consequences of limiting the quantity that is to be distributed for the people everywhere. Now, it is no use blaming this Government

[Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliyar] [2nd September 1950]

or that Government this person or that person, least of all Ministers, for they have all been victims of preconceived ideas of things without any knowledge of the scientific data. There is an old proverb, that one should not change horses in midstream. But the Food horse (laughter) here as well as in the Centre has been changed in the last few years not once, not twice but thrice. Let everybody understand that this is responsible for the disastrous things which have happened.

Now, what is the policy to be adopted? If I were inclined to be a little more critical, I would ask, we are all talking of food, for whom? There is no mention anywhere whatsoever of the most important part of the population that has to be served with food, namely, children. I was in Britain in 1948 when that country was faced with an acute food crisis. I know what the British Food Ministry did then. They took up first the problem of food for children, then the question of food for pregnant women, then the question of food for recently confined women and then they took up the question of food for the general public. Now, here, in this country, we have not given any thought whatsoever to the question of supplying food for children. I say that, because the most important food for children is milk; and may I ask, what we have done for them? It is well-known that milch cattle are becoming diseased and a number of them die because there is no fodder available. We have no time to think of the animal kingdom as we have no sufficient time to think of the human kingdom. I am glad one paper in this State brought this matter of the milch cattle to the notice of Government, and we are all indebted to it for that, and I am glad to note that the Food Minister has acknowledged the fact, after he had verified it.

Now, I want to say this: if the Food Minister and Government owe a duty to the people, as I feel they undoubtedly do, then, the only question they should consider now is, not how to reduce the rice ration every time, but to see, discarding slogans of preconceived ideas, how to bring the food necessary to prevent people from starvation. Sir, there has been an attempt made to justify the reduction in ration by saying that although the rice content of ration has been reduced to six ounces, they are giving six ounces of subsidiary food by way of wheat, milo, maida and so on. Sir, nobody knows what the effect of this diet will be on the population accustomed to rice diet entirely. Has anybody considered that? I think not. Has the opinion of nutrition expert been taken on that point. Have Government really convinced themselves that the people to whom wheat is given are in a position to utilise it properly? I know the value of wheat. It is a most nutritious food. For the last forty years I am taking wheat and I have succeeded in compelling all the members of my family to take wheat. What is the use of Government giving wheat to a labourer, who does not know how to utilise it; and even if he does know, has he the necessary ingredients to make it a complete food? The labourer has all along been accustomed to a rice diet; and even there, it is bulk that counts with him. He does not care

2nd September 1950] [Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliyar]

for quality; his stomach has been accustomed all along to take food in large quantity; his consumption is, what may be called, not six ounces, but fourteen ounces or sixteen ounces per *puta* for one meal. I know how much rice a labourer consumes as food. Anyone who has a servant under him will also know it. It is quantity that counts with him, not quality. There is, what is called, 'chintachetti chiruvu', that is, green tender leaves of the tamarind tree, in Chittoor, Kurnool and other districts in that part of the province. With that a paste-like preparation is made by the labourer, and he takes it as food along with a large quantity of rice. It is to that man, Government give wheat, maida or milo as food. I cannot believe any nutrition expert could have recommended it. When we talk of food shortage, it is not as if we ask food for the middle classes and the rich. We are not asking for the food requirements of the members of this House. In fact, looking around this House, I feel there is no food shortage in this State (laughter) judging from the features of the persons here. It is the poor man's food requirements that the Government are now called upon to meet. He has been accustomed to rice, cholam, ragi, etc., and these things have to be given to him. There is no use in attempting to give him something instead. Government cannot expect people to change overnight their food habits to suit the preconceived ideas of Government.

"The other day, if I may reveal a little of my personal experience, it was my barber who told me, 'you are in the Council, you go and talk there; what is the use of your talking there; what is the use of people going there and debating; I cannot get my rice in my ration shop.' The real truth is what little rice is available in the country is allowed to get smudgy by being exposed to sun and rain at rail heads. I have seen bags and bags of rice stocked in railway platforms for days and days together exposed to sun and rain and getting spoiled, and it is this that is eventually sold to people as food. The only explanation from the Minister for this is, that it is all due to transport difficulty. May I know why it should be so? If this had occurred when a foreign power was in power, Congressmen would have set afoot an agitation and demonstrated it in such a manner that it would have shaken the very foundation of their empire! And yet, when that very Congress is in power, on the slender plea of transport difficulty, it is allowing for thirty and forty days the very food of the people to get stuck up at rail heads, exposed to sun and rain and get smudgy! This state of affairs should never be allowed to continue. This Government should, here and now, so far as the immediate requirements of the State are concerned, whether it is a question of imports or not, should take up this question with the Central Government. Mr. Uppi Sahib says that procurement will be easy if people are paid better prices. But I may state on the basis of report by responsible authorities that in Madras State alone the best form of procurement was available. I am saying this from a report made by the Ministry of Food of the Government of India entitled Report of the Work of the Ministry of Food during the year 1949 and Policy and Proposals for 1950, a copy of which I

[Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliyar] [2nd September 1950]

purloined from my neighbour here (laughter) who, perhaps in his turn, has stealthily taken it from somewhere (laughter), for we are not supplied with such useful publications and yet we are supposed to debate intelligently here! But that is another matter to which I shall refer later. Here is what that report says—

‘Madras is the only State where the best form of food procurement is available. On the eve of food drive, with the re-imposition of control, procurement operations have been extended to the districts of the State where surplus or deficit according to the system of procurement prevails. The production and requirements of each individual producer are assessed and the whole of the surplus is procured by the Government at fixed prices.’

What more does one want? The rich landlord and his cultivator, each gets his proper requirement; and Government then take away the whole surplus. And they have taken it by not paying adequate prices! So what could Government expect a landholder to do for it when the whole of his surplus has been procured by Government without adequate payment? Recently this Government, whether of its own volition or not, paid a crore and twenty lakhs of rupees to a sister State in the north of India for a small quantity of forty thousand tons supplied. In this transaction this Government had to pay 108 lakhs of rupees more. They had no voice in fixing the price. Why did they pay 108 lakhs of rupees more? Why should they import food from that sister State by paying more price? Who was responsible? If such a thing had happened under any other form of Government, that particular individual or ministry would have had to face an inquisition. There is no question about it whatsoever. Explanations have been offered in another place that it is a superior sort of rice and that the price paid for was the same as it was in the State from which it was purchased. If that is so, we do not want such a superior sort. We will be glad to leave that superior rice to the people of that State to enjoy. That 108 lakhs of rupees could have been spent on importing from Burma not 40,000 tons of rice but even double that quantity and that would have saved the situation.

“Next let me think of what we are going to do next year and the year next to that. It is certainly not wise to speak of a long-term policy when we are still in the midstream. A policy of self-sufficiency in food by the end of 1951 was announced and accepted with alacrity. I suppose a great deal of claps were heard in that Assembly when that announcement was made. What is the meaning of that self-sufficiency? It means that we will have sufficient rice and other foodgrains to meet our requirements. This reminds me of the gentleman, five feet six inches tall, who tried to wade through a river whose average depth was four and a half feet. Needless to say, he was drowned in the midstream. Our assumption that we must be self-sufficient by 1951 is exactly similar. Have this Government protested to the Government of India that it is not possible to be self-sufficient so far as Madras is concerned? Have they got any promise from the Government of India—not the kind of promise that we get on the floor of the legislatures—but promise in writing to definitely bind them to make good our deficit after 1951? Are not the Government aware

2nd September 1950] [Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliyar]

that even according to their own admission it will not be possible for this State to be self-sufficient by 1951? Let me quote from the speech of the then Food Minister, the Hon. Dr. Rajan, in the Legislative Council on that ill-fated day—13th August 1948—I am glad that to-day at least it is not the thirteenth and I hope we will have better luck—

‘According to the Grow More Food Campaign, the target for increased production which this Government intends to produce is 6.5 lakh tons of rice and it is proposed to be attained by well subsidy scheme, construction of new private tanks, launching of 298 public works minor irrigation projects to command 2,250,000 acres, progressive manuring with sulphate of ammonia reaching up to 100,000 tons in the fifth year, manuring with phosphate plus oil cakes or green manure reaching up to 180,000 tons in the fifth year, multiplication . . .’

There is no subtraction here; it is all multiplication and increase—

‘and distribution of improved seeds for 7,100,000 by the fifth year, cultivation through mechanical means extending up to 75,000 acres in the fifth year and increased yield through contour ridging and levelling 50,000 acres in the fifth year. These are plans worked out and the House may see it is a plan for expansion through a number of years. With the resources at the disposal of the Government of Madras and the help the Government of India is giving for the Grow More Food Campaign, the result aimed at is so much.’

Mark the words that it is a plan for expansion through a number of years. According to this statement, taking it at its face value and not at its exaggerated value, it will take five years from 13th August 1948 for Madras to become self-sufficient, that is to say, Madras will be self-sufficient somewhere towards the end of 1953 or the beginning of 1954. Two years have passed by. Will the Government be pleased to tell me how many acres of fallow land have been brought under cultivation, how many wells have been sunk, how many private tanks and minor irrigation projects have been constructed, in how many places improved methods of cultivation have been adopted and how much of manure and chemical fertilisers have been distributed during these two years? I know that a certain amount of work has been done. I admit that the Government have been doing their best to sink more wells and so on. I have not got the time to go into the well subsidy scheme. In the course of the discussion on the food situation in this House on the very same 13th of August 1948, the late Sri C. N. Muthuranga Mudaliyar made a very salutary suggestion that it would be wiser for the Government to sink the wells themselves than giving a subsidy to others for sinking wells. In some cases at any rate, the wells existed only in the imagination of the individuals concerned. In the face of the declaration of the Food Minister himself that Madras is not likely to become self-sufficient till 1953 even after all these schemes are put into effect completely, what was the note that this Government sent to the Government of India with regard to their—I was almost going to say ‘slogan’ but I will not use that word—plan for self-sufficiency by 1951?

“I want to raise another question. Why is it that we want self-sufficiency in food only? Are we self-sufficient in our other requirements? Are we self-sufficient in cosmetics, hair dye, and moustache dye which are being imported to-day from dollar countries? I take a fundamental objection to this self-sufficiency

[Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliyar] [2nd September 1950]

so far as the Madras State is concerned. Our chief exporting country was Burma and our chief importing country also was Burma. The other day an article appeared in a daily newspaper which was a revelation to most of us. If we do not take something from another country, we cannot export something to that country. Our lungis and many other commodities were exported to Burma and the result was that we got some food import from that country. By such an arrangement, not only the cloth exporters benefit; the Government also can save some money or at any rate minimise the loss on food import. Now we want to stop import. In fact, it has already been stopped and the result is that we have to pay 108 lakhs of rupees to a neighbouring State for the magnanimity of supplying 40,000 tons of rice!

"There is another point on which I wish to dwell. So far as imports and exports are concerned, other countries who know their position and who are a little bit more practical than we seem to be, have realized that by entering into forward contracts with other countries they stand to gain a great deal. When other countries know our plight and when we beg of them to give us their foodgrains, they are prepared to give only at an increased cost. By our unfortunate fetish of restricting import, we are in a very difficult position now. Why is it that forward contracts to cover the next three or four years are not made with other countries? Is it not possible for the Government to consider this aspect, bargain for favourable terms and enter into forward contracts with rice-producing countries? It seems to me there has been no clear thinking on this question of food supply with the result that we are beset with disastrous consequences at every stop.

"I wish to say a few words about our own food supply position. I have been credibly informed that, since the Government took over the zamindaris, the food production in them has gone down. Formerly the zamindars were supplying cattle, manure and seeds and making cash advances. To-day that help is not forthcoming and the cultivator is not in a position to cultivate the land. We were told by the then Revenue Minister that the Zamindari Abolition Bill would be panacea for all the ills of this world and probably of the other world too. Let me not be misunderstood. I am not raising the question of zamindari abolition. I am referring to the effect on food production, because the Government are going to take over more and more of zamindaris. There is no correlation between the different departments, much less between the different Ministers themselves. Let me have a categorical answer with facts and figures, instead of a plain denial whether it is a fact that food production in the zamindaris has preceptibly decreased consequent upon the Government suddenly taking them over without the necessary machinery or resources to derive the maximum benefit from the land.

"I am sorry I have taken more time. If the Hon. Chairman will permit me, I shall conclude in about five minutes."

2nd September 1950]

MR. CHAIRMAN :—" Yes."

DR. A. LAKSHMANASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" I have heard it before and to-day also the same sentiment has been voiced forth by my esteemed Friend Sri Mothey Narayana Rao that agrarian reform is a panacea for all the ills. He has quoted a very great authority for whom we have great reverence. Mahatma Gandhi, I see, is not often quoted nowadays. I am glad that Mr. Mothey Narayana Rao quoted him to-day. When we speak of Mahatma Gandhi's advice, let us not confine ourselves only to those matters in which his advice suits us. Let us take his whole outlook on life. If we are honest to ourselves and if we do not want to be self-deceptive, let us accept his mode of life. If we can go back to the villages, if we can manage with one shawl and one veshti, if we can travel in the stone-wheeled double-bullock carts to which we were accustomed fifty or sixty years ago in the district of Kurnool, if we can live without all the modern luxuries or whatever we may call them—why should we think of extending electricity, Machkund Project and Ramapadasagar Project? Why should we not go down to the level of our ancestors three hundred years ago, not to speak of the Vedic age—if that is the way in which we should live, I tell you sincerely that I am one with you. But let us not just for the nonce take up some particular thing.

" Mr. Mothey Narayana Rao said that the cultivator should get the benefit. I am all for looking into the question of how much the actual tiller of the soil should get out of the produce. This again is a camouflage and a slogan that the tiller of the soil alone should get all the benefit. There is no person who is the actual tiller of the soil. If I have got one acre, my wife and I cannot till the land with the help of a pair of bulls. I must have the assistance of either labour or co-operation. There has been too much loose talk about the tiller of the soil. It is said that the tiller of the soil should get more benefit and that the absentee landlord should part with more and more of his rights. If we parcel out an extensive land into bits of one acre and two acres and let them to an army of people, they will not find it self-supporting and the land will lie fallow within three years."

SRI MOTHEY NARAYANA RAO :—" There must be collective or co-operative farming."

DR. A. LAKSHMANASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—" The hon. Member suggests that there must be collective or co-operative farming as there is in Denmark, Sweden and Switzerland. If the resources are pooled and co-operative societies are formed, certainly they can do much. But co-operative societies have got to turn a new leaf in many cases before they can take up this item of work, judging from the experience of a co-operative society which is within a distance of twenty-five miles from Madras.

" We see from reports appearing in the Press that unorthodox methods are being adopted in the Tanjore district to terminate the mirasdars. There are no zamindars now and I do not know when

[Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliyar] [2nd September 1950]

the orthodox method will be adopted to put an end to mirasdars. The mirasdars are not in a position to look after the cultivation of their own lands. A mirasdar told me—he has no reason to give a false account and I have no reason to disbelieve his version—that he dared not go to his village to look after his lands for fear of being not merely thrashed but finished off. That is the position in several taluks of the Tanjore district. I should like to know whether the representative from Tanjore, who is present here, is going to contradict me. That fear must go. The Government must not make loose statements about the rights of agriculturists and mirasdars. Let them not create the impression which unfortunately they have created in the past that something dreadful is happening, that the mirasdar is the villain of the piece and that he is treating the agricultural labour badly. Instead of saying all these things, let the Government do something practical to help agricultural labourers.

“Food supply is a very difficult problem and we can tackle it only by facing facts. I believe it is not possible to collect more by procurement even with the aid of the whole police force of the Madras State including the Malabar Special Police if my Hon. Friend, the Home Minister will allow their services to be utilized. To tide over the difficulty, there is only one way and that is to press the Government of India to import more rice, not wheat, not milo. When we pay for milo from far-off America, should we not pay for rice from Burma which is nearer home? We are thinking of getting rice from Madhya Pradesh and Utter Pradesh. Do the Government know that transport of rice by railway is very difficult and costly and that transport by steamer is cheaper? We can bring Burma rice by steamer and thereby save some money in the cost of transport. I hope this at least will tempt the Government to try this alternative method. But we must get rice at any cost.

“Much has been said about the fact that there have been no starvation deaths. Are an enlightened Government going to look into starvation deaths and then revise their food policy? I think the Government ought to be aware—their experts in the Medical and Health Departments will at least tell them—that the system of a person who has not got at least the minimum sustenance will deteriorate and be liable to fall an easy victim to any disease that passes by. Such a person may contract even new diseases.

“On all these grounds, I feel that the Government must revise their food policy. They must make their views known clearly, logically and in a determined voice to those who dictate the policy. I am all for following an All-India policy, provided it does not mean that Madras should go on tightening its belt and reducing its rice ration. I read in the newspaper that in some place only three ounces of rice are given and that the remaining portion of the ration is given in the shape of millets. That is a wrong policy. The Government speak of Communism. Let me tell them that Communism thrives when the stomach is empty. When the people have enough food to eat, they will not turn to Communism. The greatest asset to Communism is starvation. I therefore hope that the Madras Government will revise their food policy.”

2nd September 1950]

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“ Is it the sense of the House that we should continue the debate on another day? ”

THE HON. SRI K. MADHAVA MENON :—“ I think, Sir, that 5 p.m. we can continue this debate on the next day when the Council meets again, because there are five or six more Hon. Members to speak and we would require at least two more hours. I think it is better that we adjourn the House now and continue the debate on the next day when we meet again.”

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“ Can the Hon. Minister tell us when we are likely to meet again? ”

THE HON. SRI K. MADHAVA MENON :—“ I cannot immediately tell you, Sir, when we will be meeting again, because there is only one Bill that has been passed in the Lower House and another Bill is under discussion and it will take two or three days more for its being passed in that House. I cannot therefore say exactly when we shall have sufficient work to call for a meeting of the Council.”

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“ What about the Hindu Religious Endowments Bill? ”

THE HON. SRI K. MADHAVA MENON :—“ I do not know, Sir, when it will be taken up and how long it is likely to be discussed in the other House. There are some other Bills besides that and I think it will take some more time, so that by the end of this month we may be able to meet again when we will have enough work for the Council.”

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“ The object of this debate is to tell the Government about the impressions of hon. Members. That has been done to some extent. There is no question of any more motions or amendments being carried. The idea is that the Government ought to know what is going on in the country with regard to the food situation. May I know what the hon. Leader of the Opposition has to say on this matter.”

JANAB ABDUL LATIF FAROOKHI :—“ Judging from the sense of hon. Members on this side of the House, and of the importance of this subject, I submit, Sir, that the debate may be continued for another day instead of sitting for some more time, say, half an hour or one hour to-day and finishing it. Let hon. Members express their views fully so that we may strengthen the hands of the Madras Government to make better representations to the Central Government and try to get as much of foodgrains as possible. In that view, Sir, it is better to continue the debate on the next day also.”

MR. CHAIRMAN :—“ The House will now adjourn *sine die*.”